

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION	NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,113		12/29/2003	Pao-Ter Huang	18360-272883	1753
826	7590	08/01/2006		EXAMINER	
ALSTO		RD LLP RICA PLAZA	JOERGER, KAITLIN S		
	· ·	ON STREET, SUIT	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000				3653	
			DATE MAILED: 08/01/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/748,113	HUANG ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Kaitlin S. Joerger	3653				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Ame	endment filed 31 March 2006.					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
7,—	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application	٦.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(s) is ol	ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachmen	• •	» —	(070.440)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							

Application/Control Number: 10/748,113

Art Unit: 3653

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 31-49, and 51 of U.S. Patent No. 5,908,283 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,669,007. U.S. Patent teaches all of the limitation of the claimed subject matter of the instant application except that the length dimension determination is made in the order that the packages were received. U.S. Patent No. 6,669,007 teaches this feature, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine the length dimension of the packages in the order the packages were received in order to efficiently move the packages into the accumulator. This obvious combination anticipates the claims of the instant application, and therefore the claims are rejected under obviousness-type double patenting.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 14-16 of Remarks, filed 31 March 2006, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive.

The rejection of claims 1-18 has been withdrawn.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaitlin S. Joerger whose telephone number is 571-272-6938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ksj *US* Application/Control Number: 10/748,113

Art Unit: 3653

9 June 2006

Page 4